



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/014,308

11/13/2001

Scott D. Leapman

P1748US00

3163

7590

01/25/2006

GATEWAY, INC.

Attention: Kenneth J. Cool

610 Gateway Drive, MD Y-04

N. Sioux City, SD 57049

EXAMINER

BONSHOCK, DENNIS G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/014,308	LEAPMAN, SCOTT D.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Dennis G. Bonshock	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-27, 29 and 31-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-27, 29, and 31-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

***Final Rejection***

***Response to Amendment***

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed on record in the file: Amendment as received on 10-27-2005.

2. Claims 1-13, 15-27, 29, and 31-33 have been examined.

Status of Claims:

3. Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-13, 15, 17-19, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gettemy et al., Patent #6,603,469, hereinafter Gettemy.

4. Claims 3, 6, 16, 20, 21, 23-27, 29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gettemy and Kim, Patent #5,670,972.

5. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gettemy, Kim, and Petty et al., Patent #6,546,263, hereinafter Petty.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gettemy and Petty et al., Patent #6,546,263, hereinafter Petty.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gettemy, Kim, and Friesen, Patent #6,496,884.

8. Claims 14, 28, 30 have been cancelled by the applicant.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed 11-13-2001 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all

other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

### ***Claim Objections***

9. Claims 32 and 33 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claims state "connecting the fault condition" where this is believed to mean to state "correcting the fault condition". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-13, 15, 17-19, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gettemy et al., Patent #6,603,469, hereinafter Gettemy.

12. With regard to claim 1, which teaches a method, comprising: detecting a fault condition, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-20, detecting when the battery falls below a certain predefined threshold. With regard to claim 1, further teaching determining a solution for correcting the fault condition, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-25, providing a message that allows the user to change the display to prolong

Art Unit: 2173

battery life. With regard to claim 1, further teaching providing a graphical depiction, which illustrates the solution to the fault condition, wherein the graphical depiction is displayed on a display device, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-25, providing a message, on the display screen, that allows the user to change the display to prolong battery life. With regard to claim 1, further teaching determining a highly probable solution for correcting said fault condition and providing a first graphical depiction which illustrates the highly probable solution, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-28 and in figures 7-9, displaying a graphical depiction to the user suggesting switching the display to a monochrome mode. With regard to claim 1, further teaching determining a further solution for correcting said fault and providing a further graphical depiction which illustrates the further solution, Gettemy teaches, in column 9, lines 18-29, column 2, lines 15-28, and in figures 7-9, that if the display is already in monochrome mode and the battery energy level still falls below the critical level, then a critically low battery warning is provided to the user (telling them they need to charge).

13. With regard to claim 2, which teaches the fault condition being one of lack of connectivity, lack of alternating current electrical source, and low battery power, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-20, detecting when the battery falls below a certain predefined threshold.

14. With regard to claims 5, 10, and 17, which teach the graphical depiction being one of static depiction and an animated depiction, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-25 and in figure 10, providing a message, on the display screen, in the form of a static message.

15. With regard to claim 8, which teaches a method comprising: providing a help routine including a list of functions an apparatus is capable of performing in response to activation by a user, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-25 and in figures 7-9, providing a message, on the display screen, that helps the user to prolong battery life by offering an option to change the display to prolong battery life, the functions the user is capable of performing are to <place in monochrome display mode> or <maintain display in color mode>. With regard to claim 8, further teaching receiving from a user a selection of a particular function, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-20, column 9, lines 5-17, and in figures 9 and 10, the receipt of a user selection of a command to leave in color or to change to mono. With regard to claim 8, further teaching responsive to the selection by the user, displaying a graphical depiction of at least one step for activating the particular function on a display device of the apparatus, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-20, column 9, lines 5-17, and in figures 9 and 10, the receipt of a user selection, through a graphical depiction of options, of command to leave in color or to change to mono, this function is then carried out. Gettemy further teaches, in column 9, lines 18-29, column 2, lines 15-28, and in figures 7-9, that if the display is already in monochrome mode and the battery energy level still falls below the critical level, then a critically low battery warning is provided to the user (telling them they need to charge).

16. With regard to claim 9, which teaches providing a display suitable for a user to perform a first step in activating the particular function, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-20, column 9, lines 5-17, and in figures 9 and 10, the user providing a selection through a graphical depiction of options.

Art Unit: 2173

17. With regard to claims 11 and 18, which teach the graphical depiction being in color, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-20, the use of a color display.

18. With regard to claims 12 and 19, which teaches the apparatus being at least one of a cellular telephone, a personal digital assistant, a monitor, television, a remote control, a computer, a CD player, a DVD player, a digital storage medium player and a network device, Gettemy teaches, in column 1, line 66 through column 2, line 4, the system being implemented in a cell phone, PDA, etc.

19. With regard to claim 13, which teaches an apparatus, comprising: detecting means for detecting a fault connection, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-20, determining if the battery falls below a certain predefined threshold before displaying the options screen. With regard to claim 13, further teaching a controller coupled to the determining means, a memory coupled to the controller, and a display device coupled to the controller, Gettemy teaches, in column 6, lines 25-63, and in figure 5, the circuitry of the computer system comprising a processor, a controller, a memory unit, a display device, etc. all connected together. With regard to claim 13, further teaching displaying to the user an appropriate depiction of a highly probable solution, if a fault condition is detected, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-28 and in figures 7-9, displaying a graphical depiction to the user suggesting switching the display to a monochrome mode. With regard to claim 13, further teaching determining a further solution for correcting said fault and providing a further graphical detection which illustrates the further solution, Gettemy teaches, in column 9, lines 18-29, column 2, lines 15-28, and in figures 7-9, that if the display is already in monochrome mode and the battery energy

Art Unit: 2173

level still falls below the critical level, then a critically low battery warning is provided to the user (telling them they need to charge).

20. With regard to claim 15, which teaches the detecting means including an interface capable of receiving an input from a user that instruction in necessary regarding activating a function of the apparatus, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-20, column 9, lines 5-17, and in figures 9 and 10, the receipt of a user selection, through a graphical depiction of options, of command to leave in color or to change to mono, this function is then carried out.

21. With regard to claims 32 and 33, further teaching the highly probable solution for connecting the fault condition is capable of completely eliminating the fault condition, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-36, the switching to monochrome solution being a solution to a problem, where this maintains battery power until the battery energy return to normal levels, and the color mode can be reentered automatically.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. Claims 3, 6, 16, 20, 21, 23-27, 29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gettemy and Kim, Patent #5,670,972.



24. With regard to claims 3 and 16, Gettemy teaches a system for detecting faults and providing graphical displays, which illustrate a solution (see column 2, lines 15-25). Gettemy, however, doesn't specifically disclose the use of this type of trouble-shooting used for detecting an absence of a signal. Kim, teaches, a system that provides the user with a graphical depiction of help information, but further teaches the system detecting the absence of a signal (see column 1, lines 20-30 and lines 50-63 and in column 6, lines 50-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Gettemy and Kim before him at the time the invention was made to modify the trouble-shooting system of Gettemy to include the detection of missing signals as did Kim. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because the detection and notification system of Gettemy could lack an input from a PC, to the PDA which is gaining information through the cradle, as shown in column 6, lines 16-24.

25. With regard to claim 6, Gettemy teaches a system for detecting faults and providing graphical displays, which illustrate a solution (see column 2, lines 15-25). Gettemy, however, doesn't specifically disclose the use of his type of trouble shooting used for detecting an absence of a video signal. Kim, teaches, a system that provides the user with a graphical depiction of help information, similar to that of Gettemy, but further teaches the system detecting the absence of a video signal (see column 1, lines 20-30 and lines 50-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Gettemy and Kim before him at the time the invention was made to modify the trouble-shooting system of Gettemy to include the detection of

missing video signals as did Kim. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because the detection and notification system of Gettemy could lack an input from a PC, to the PDA which is gaining information through the cradle, as shown in column 6, lines 16-24.

26. With regard to claim 20, Gettemy teaches a housing including a display (see column 4, lines 48-51, a connector disposed on the housing (see column 4, lines 48-52), and a system that detects solutions to problems with the device and provides a graphical depiction of the solutions to the user (see column 2, lines 15-28 and figures 7-9). Gettemy, however, doesn't teach the determined fault being of whether a connection is made with a connector and displaying a pictorial solution providing should it be detected that a proper connection is not made. Kim teaches, a system that provides the user with a graphical depiction of help information in a self-diagnostic system, similar to that of Gettemy, but further teaches the system detecting the absence of a video signal and providing the user with a pictorial image to confirm whether the proper connection is made (see column 1, lines 20-30 and lines 50-63 and in column 6, lines 50-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Gettemy and Kim before him at the time the invention was made to modify the trouble-shooting system of Gettemy to include the detection of missing video signals as did Kim. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because the detection and notification system of Gettemy could lack an input from a PC, to the PDA which gains information through the cradle, as shown in column 6, lines 16-24.

Art Unit: 2173

27. With regard to claim 21, which teaches means for displaying being capable of displaying a graphical depiction of the solution on the display, Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-25, providing a message (graphical depiction), on the display screen, that allows the user to change the display to prolong battery life. Kim teaches a similar graphical depiction as stated above in claim 20.

28. With regard to claims 23, which teaches the housing being at least one of a monitor, a television, a computer, a personal digital assistant, a DVD player, a CD player, a digital storage medium player and a network device, Gettemy teaches, in column 1, line 66 through column 2, line 4, the system being implemented in a cell phone, PDA, etc.

29. With regard to claim 24, which teaches the means for displaying being disposed in a housing with the display, Gettemy teaches in column 4, lines 57-61, the display being in the cover of the system.

30. With regard to claim 25, which teaches means for displaying further displaying a message indicating that a proper connection is made with the connector when the detecting means detects the proper connection is made with the connector, Kim teaches, in column 1, lines 50-65 and in column 6, lines 50-55, the display of a message in the self-diagnostic system indicating a status of the connection.

31. With regard to claim 26, Gettemy teaches a housing including a display (see column 4, lines 48-51, a connector disposed on the housing (see column 4, lines 48-52), and a system that detects solutions to problems with the device and provides a graphical depiction (iconographical depiction) of the solutions to the user (see column 2,

Art Unit: 2173

lines 15-28 and figures 7-9). Gettemy, however, doesn't teach the determined fault being of whether a connection is made with a connector and displaying a pictorial solution providing should it be detected that a proper connection is not made. Kim teaches, a system that provides the user with a graphical depiction of help information in a self-diagnostic system, similar to that of Gettemy, but further teaches the system detecting the absence of a video signal and providing the user with a pictorial image to confirm whether the proper connection is made (see column 1, lines 20-30 and lines 50-63 and in column 6, lines 50-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Gettemy and Kim before him at the time the invention was made to modify the trouble-shooting system of Gettemy to include the detection of missing video signals, as did Kim. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because the detection and notification system of Gettemy could lack an input from a PC, to the PDA which gains information through the cradle, as shown in column 6, lines 16-24.

32. With regard to claim 27, which teaches means for displaying further displaying a message indicating that a proper connection is made with the connector when the detecting means detects the proper connection is made with the connector, Kim teaches, in column 1, lines 50-65 and in column 6, lines 50-55, the display of a message in the self-diagnostic system indicating a status of the connection.

33. With regard to claim 29, Gettemy teaches a system for detecting faults and providing graphical displays, which illustrate a solution (see column 2, lines 15-25). Gettemy, however, doesn't specifically disclose the detection of a proper connection

with a connector. Kim, teaches, a system that provides the user with a graphical depiction of help information, but further teaches the system detecting the absence of a signal, and whether or not the cable is connected to (see column 1, lines 20-30 and lines 50-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Gettemy and Kim before him at the time the invention was made to modify the trouble-shooting system of Gettemy to include the detection of missing signals as did Kim. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because the detection and notification system of Gettemy could lack an input from a PC, to the PDA which is gaining information through the cradle, as shown in column 6, lines 16-24.

34. With regard to claim 31, Gettemy teaches a housing including a display (see column 4, lines 48-51, a connector disposed on the housing (see column 4, lines 48-52), and a system that detects solutions to problems with the device and provides a graphical depiction of the solutions to the user (see column 2, lines 15-28 and figures 7-9). Gettemy, however, doesn't teach displaying a non-textual description of said at least one step. Kim teaches, a system that provides the user with a graphical depiction of help information in a self-diagnostic system, similar to that of Gettemy, but further teaches the system detecting the absence of a video signal and providing the user with a pictorial image (non-textural image) to confirm whether the proper connection is made (see column 1, lines 20-30 and lines 50-63 and in column 6, lines 50-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Gettemy and Kim before him at the time the invention was made to modify the trouble-shooting system of Gettemy to include the non-textural image, as did Kim. One would have been motivated

to make such a combination because the non-textural depiction provides a multilingual quickly recognizable guide to a problem.

35. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gettemy, Kim, and Petty et al., Patent #6,546,263, hereinafter Petty.

36. With regard to claim 22, Gettemy and Kim teach a system for displaying solutions to issues in the computer system on the display, but don't specifically teach the solutions being animated on the display. Petty teaches a system for providing a visual representation of a plurality of faults/conditions that can be present on a system, similar to that of Gettemy and Kim, however, Petty further teaches, in column 3, line 54 through column 4, line 7 and in figure 1b, a icon that rotates through states to display a corresponding updated status of the system battery power (providing an indication of when to charge). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Gettemy, Kim, and Petty before him at the time the invention was made to modify trouble-shooting system of Gettemy and Kim to include the animated depiction of the fault, as did Petty. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this provides the user with a better representation of exactly how much time they have before they must charge the system.

35. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gettemy and Petty et al., Patent #6,546,263, hereinafter Petty.

36. With regard to claim 4, Gettemy teaches a system for detecting faults and providing graphical displays, which illustrate a solution (see column 2, lines 15-25). Gettemy, however, doesn't specifically disclose the removing of the graphical depiction from the display device when the fault condition has been corrected. Petty teaches a system for providing a visual representation of a plurality of faults/conditions that can be present on a system (see column 3, line 54 through column 4, line 7), similar to that of Gettemy, however, Petty further teaches removing the graphical depiction from the display when it is no longer in fault (see column 3, line 54 through column 4, line 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Gettemy and Petty before him at the time the invention was made to modify troubleshooting system of Gettemy to include the removal of the graphical depiction of the fault upon correction. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because there would be no purpose to display the fault correction screen if the fault no longer exists.

37. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gettemy, Kim, and Friesen, Patent #6,496,884.

38. With regard to claim 7, Gettemy teaches a system for detecting faults and providing graphical displays, which illustrate a solution (see column 2, lines 15-25). Gettemy, however, doesn't specifically disclose the graphical depiction including a color-coded monitor cable being plugged into a color-coded connector. Kim, teaches, a system that provides the user with a graphical depiction of help information, but further

teaches the system detecting the absence of a video signal, possibly because of a lack of a connection between a signal cable and a cable connector (see column 1, lines 20-30 and lines 50-63 and in column 6, lines 50-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Gettemy and Kim before him at the time the invention was made to modify the trouble-shooting system of Gettemy to include the detection of missing video signals as did Kim. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because the detection and notification system of Gettemy could lack an input from a PC, to the PDA which is gaining information through the cradle, as shown in column 6, lines 16-24. Gettemy and Kim, however, don't teach the user of color-coded monitor cables being plugged into a color-coded connector. Friesen teaches a system of connecting a system to a monitor as did Gettemy and Kim, but further teaches color-coded cables being plugged into color-coded ports (as is frequently used in the art, ex. component video) (see column 2, lines 31-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Gettemy, Kim, and Friesen before him at the time the invention was made to modify the trouble-shooting system of Gettemy and Kim to include the color-coded connection system of Friesen. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would help to further limit confusion of the user and minimize faults.

### ***Response to Arguments***

39. The arguments filed on 10-27-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Reasons set forth below.



Art Unit: 2173

40. The applicants' argue that the Gettemy reference doesn't teach a solution when teaching asking the user to change the display mode, therefor not providing a solution to the underlining fault.

41. In response, the examiner respectfully submits that Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-28 and in figures 7-9, displaying a graphical depiction to the user suggesting switching the display to a monochrome mode, thereby providing the user with an indication of a solution to the problem of a dying battery, prolonging its battery life.

Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-36, the switching to monochrome solution being a solution to a problem, where this is capable of sustaining battery power until the battery energy returns to a normal level, and the color mode can be reentered automatically.

42. The applicants' argue that there is no determination of a further solution, and that the second solution is the same as the first.

43. In response, the examiner respectfully submits that Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-28 and in figures 7-9, displaying a graphical depiction to the user suggesting switching the display to a monochrome mode, Gettemy further teaches, in column 9, lines 18-29, column 2, lines 15-28, and in figures 7-9, that if the display is already in monochrome mode and the battery energy level still falls below the critical level, then a critically low battery warning is provided to the user (telling them they need to charge). This is accomplished by plugging the device into a dock/charger (column 1, lines 46-51, column 6, lines 16-24, and column 9, lines 18-24, and figure 4) which is a function a user is capable of implementing on the device.

44. The applicants' argue that the Gettemy reference doesn't teach a permanent solution and specifically that the highly probable solution for connecting the fault condition is capable of completely eliminating the fault condition.

45. In response, the examiner respectfully submits that Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-36, the switching to monochrome solution being a solution to a problem, where this is capable of sustaining battery power until the battery energy returns to a normal level, and the color mode can be reentered automatically. As with any problem a cause can reoccur causing the system to relapse.

46. The applicants' argue that the functions are not function that the user is capable of performing, and the message "maintain display in color mode" does not even appear to be a particular function to be performed but rather to simply be a passive action.

47. In response, the examiner respectfully submits that placing a display device into a monochrome mode from a color mode (see column 2, lines 15-36), and plugging a device into a dock/charger (column 1, lines 46-51, column 6, lines 16-24, and column 9, lines 18-24, and figure 4) are both functions a user is capable of implementing on a device.

48. The applicants' argue that there is no teaching in Kim of providing a pictorial depiction of a solution to correcting these problems.

49. In response, the examiner respectfully submits that Kim teaches, in column 1, lines 55-65, a self diagnostic video display where pictorial images are displayed providing the user with system state information to aid in fixing the problems.

Art Unit: 2173

50. The applicants' argue that Petty doesn't teach a graphical display for correcting a fault condition.

51. In response, the examiner respectfully submits that that Petty teaches graphical depiction of a fault condition is displaying a battery on the display with a correspondingly low graphical depiction of battery strength (see column 3, line 54 through column 4, line 7).

52. The applicants' argue that there is no teaching in the references, which would lead to providing a graphical depiction of a color-coded monitor cable being plugged into a color coded connector.

53. In response, the examiner respectfully submits that Gettemy, in column 2, lines 15-36, which teaches detecting a fault and providing a message that allows the user to change the display to prolong battery life, thereby providing the user with an indication of a means to prolong his/her battery life (solution to the problem). Kim teaches, in column 1, lines 50-65 and in lines 20-25, a video display capable of self diagnosis, where several pictorial representations are displayed on the screen to show the user whether the monitor is connected or disconnected so as to show the user the cause of the lack of picture, similar to the teaching of Gettemy, where the lack of picture could be because of a lack of a connection between a signal cable and a cable connector (see column 1, lines 20-30 and lines 50-63 and in column 6, lines 50-55).

This is further supplemented by the Friesen reference teaching, in column 2, lines 31-51, the use of color-coded monitor cables (as is frequently known in the art, ex. component video). The combination of these references is obvious, given the similar

Art Unit: 2173

depictions of fault solutions of Gettemy and Kim, and further the use of color-coded monitor cables, of Friesen, for a display similar to that of Kim.

### ***Conclusion***

54. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

55. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


56. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis G. Bonshock whose telephone number is (571) 272-4047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 6:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Art Unit: 2173

57. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

58. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

12-22-05  
dgb



**RAYMOND J. BAYERL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 2173**